1	PHILLIP A. TALBERT		
2	United States Attorney ADRIAN T. KINSELLA		
3	Assistant United States Attorney 501 I Street, Suite 10-100		
4	Sacramento, CA 95814 Telephone: (916) 554-2700		
5	Facsimile: (916) 554-2900		
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff United States of America		
7	Officed States of Afficient		
8	IN THE UNITED ST	TATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	CASE NO. 2:20-CR-00123-JAM-2	
12	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT;	
13	v.	ORDER	
14	NATHANIEL OPONDO HUBBERT,	DATE: January 25, 2022	
15	Defendant.	TIME: 9:30 a.m. COURT: Hon. John A. Mendez	
16			
17	STIPU	LATION	
18	1. By previous order, this matter wa	s set for a status conference on January 25, 2022.	
19	2. By this stipulation, Counsel for Mr. Hubbert now moves to continue the status conference		
20	until April 26, 2022 at 9:30 a.m., and to exclude time between January 25, 2022, and April 26, 2022,		
21	under Local Code T4.		
22	3. The parties agree and stipulate, and request that the Court find the following:		
23	a) The government has represented that the discovery associated with this case		
24	includes over eight gigabytes of evidence in electronic form, including police reports, pictures,		
25	multiple hours of video footage, laborato	ry reports, search warrants, a forensic cellular phone	
26	report, and criminal history documents. All of this discovery has been either produced directly		
27	to counsel and/or made available for inspection and copying.		
28	b) Counsel for Mr. Hubbert of	desires additional time to gather additional criminal	

17 18

15

16

19

20

21

23

22

24 25

26

27 28

STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE TIME

PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT

history documents, consult with her client, conduct further review of her client's criminal history, conduct interviews and prepare evidence in mitigation, discuss potential resolutions with her client, and otherwise prepare for trial.

- Counsel for Mr. Hubbert believes that failure to grant the above-requested c) continuance would deny her the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
 - d) The government does not object to the continuance.
- e) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.
- f) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period of January 25, 2022 to April 26, 2022, inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C.§ 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code T4] because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at defendant's request on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

Case 2:20-cr-00123-JAM Document 75 Filed 01/21/22 Page 3 of 3

1	4. Nothing in this stipulation and order	shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the
2	Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods	s are excludable from the period within which a trial
3	must commence.	
4	IT IS SO STIPULATED.	
5	Dated: January 20, 2022	PHILLIP A. TALBERT
6		United States Attorney
7		/s/ ADRIAN T. KINSELLA
8		ADRIAN T. KINSELLA Assistant United States Attorney
9		
10	Dated: January 20, 2022	/s/ KRESTA DALY KRESTA DALY
11		Counsel for Defendant NATHANIEL OPONDO HUBBERT
12	O.D.	DED
13	ORDER IT IS SO FOUND AND ORDERED this 20 th day of January, 2022.	
14	11 18 SO FOUND AND ORDERED this 20'	ay of January, 2022.
15		/s/ John A. Mendez
16		THE HONORABLE JOHN A. MENDEZ
		UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
17		
17 18		
18 19		
18		
18 19 20 21		
18 19 20 21 22		
18 19 20 21 22 23		
18 19 20		
18 19 20 21 22 23 24		
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25		
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26		